Gerry -

Title, JFK face selected for dust-jacket cover, not consistent with what he says in preface, use of Exner picture only of all JFK's women, single ref. to Hitchcock & its nature plus impression took made on Post's reviewer, persuade me to begin with that he intends exploitation rather than solid history and that he is selective in what he uses of JFK's personal life. Also on that, inadequate scholarship from what Hitchcock told me.

p.2 He does not date JFK's "support of nuclear test ban" speech, does not identify JFK's

2) 6/63 speech ( ) so reader can go to & (Times, Univ) & it is not in his notes. Scholarship? Writing for history? I think not.

This and what follows suggests he is contriving the appearance of fairness. His failure to correctly characterize Vic Lasky & his book, if not also to connect him with taking money for political services to GOP/CREEP/Nixon (p 3) less than honest.

His representation of the Sorensen & Schlesinger books is dishonest in that he has selected a few things to serve his purposes while not giving the reader even a hint that they are lengthy & detailed accounts of the JFK administration & its policy problems, etc.

3) What is ( ) there at all abnormal ( ) in the family seeking favorable comment, how does this in any way depart from the past? This pro[illegible] dishonest & angled writing especially in its failure to [illegible] Bishop [illegible] trashy & dishonest [illegible]

He does not give the reader any meaningful account of the nature of the controversy or of the views of authors like Collier & Horowitz. I, for example, was an early in-depth critic & I was aired on this in an interview on CBS radio. (Through p 5)

On p 6 he is anything but an impartial historian in his failure to identify Dick Whalen's politics & record of an anti-Kennedy hireling. Whether or not he is basically correct in the fact in his book by [illegible] it is clear that JFK was NOT "wholly under the influence of" his father. By this early point in his book I raise questions about Reeves' honesty as well as his professionalism.

Whalen, as Reeves omits, is a well-known ultra-conservative to whom character assassination is not strange when he has a political purpose. I saved him when he was lost in a Sat. Eve Post ~~art~~ article on the JFK ass. in late 1966. He had his children call me "Uncle" yet see what he wrote about me in that article after it was out he begged me not to do with him what I did

4/ [illegible] in ; ) [illegible] not
not reason to ; ) in intents.
But Reeves presents him as to dependable & as impartial when he is the opposite.

Compare what he does not tell the reader about Whalen, Lasky, Bishop etc. with the way he ~~[illegible]~~ treats Sorensen, Schlesinger and I think it is apparent, this early in the book, that Reeves is dishonest & intends as is a political assassination.

On 6, is there any abnormality in what is withheld? Only under "National Security"? No other reason, like right to privacy?

Even in his selection from Bradlee, is this in any way exceptional? Why ~~[illegible]~~ does Reeves not confirm, if he has any legitimate, scholarly, reason for all this stuff, whether other presidents, other politicians, like Ike, Nixon. Why is Bradlee a fine one to quote on infidelity?

On 7, how is JFK's use of it more "shocking" than that of other presidents? He at least infers that it was unique in this writing.

My source on Hoover "confronting" JFK "directly" on Exner & I believe it is false.

That later in a ghosted book Exner said JFK contemplated divorce does not make it true or even credible. It is the opposite of what Hitch [illegible] told me & I believe is false and mad

8) deliberate ; Reeves dishonesty
& unprofessional - ; here

These articles do not mean JFK was not "the man we thought he was." They refer only to his personal life & the "man" was a President with a record as President. Even this is carefully and deliberately writing not what is to be said, it is [illegible].

P 8 - What makes Clay Blair "objective" other than Reeves' purpose? And it was not Blair in 1976 who first disclosed JFK's "health" problem - Addison's disease. Dr. Janet Travell did it ~~[illegible]~~ a decade earlier. So much for Reeves' scholarship. But in fact JFK's "health" was never a problem in his presidency, as health was in Ike's, LBJ's & other administrations.

P 9. Reeves' writing here is deliberately tricky to imply what he could not say. Even if it is true that in some way Sorensen had a "dominant role in the creation of Profiles in Courage" that does not mean that it was not JFK's book or that JFK did not write it. He had written earlier - writing was not strange to him - he was an articulate, sometimes ~~[illegible]~~ eloquent man. It's [illegible] so what is Reeves really saying. Compare with my "dominant role" in Kelly's documentary - it nonetheless is his

6/ documents ; ) wrong & not
in any ; ) some more.
Reeves says nothing to even suggest that Sorensen helped in research, editing or [illegible], all normal.

No citation on JFK & RFK being "tied directly" to CIA's attempted assassination of Castro & the CIA records I have say this is false!

What he says of JFK & Bay of Pigs - JFK's "questionable judgement" is ignorant, dishonest or both, beginning with the false representation that it was JFK's project rather than that of the Eisenhower administration that left JFK little option, esp. in the very first days of his administration. Here again there is a question of his [illegible] sources, dependability, objectivity.

Parmet, in the faithlessness with which Reeves uses it.

Collier, Horowitz & John Davis are not impartial sources & Davis' statement that JFK used Exner to "monitor" the CIA's Mafia plot is not credible in any way